UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,382	12/29/2004	Alain Sanson	263859US0X PCT	7625

22850 7590 11/21/2007

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
GUPTA, ANISH	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1654	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/21/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/518,382	SANSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anish Gupta	1654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 January 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *12-20,24 and 25* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5 and 6* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *4,7-11,21,22,26 and 27* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4-18-05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-11, 21-23, 26 and 27 in the reply filed on July 02, 2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that Annex B of the Administrative Instructions Under PCT, paragraph (c), states that "unity of invention has to be considered in the fist pace only in relation to independent claims in a international application and not dependent claims." Claims 10, 12, 14 and 16 all depend form claim 9. "Applicants submit that the Examiner has not carried the burden of providing reasons or examples specifically supporting a conclusion that the groups lack unit of invention nor has dependency of claims 10, 12, 14, 16 and 9 been considered." Further, Applicants argue that the Groups V and VI share unity based on 37 CFR 1.475(b)(3).

This is not found persuasive because the MPEP, regarding dependency the MPEP states:

> "The examiner should bear in mind that a claim may also contain a reference to another claim even if it is not a dependent claim as defined in PCT Rule 6.4. One example of this is a claim referring to a claim of a different category (for example, "Apparatus for carrying out the process of Claim 1 ...," or "Process for the manufacture of the product of Claim 1 ..."). Similarly, a claim to one part referring to another cooperating part, for example, "plug for cooperation with the socket of Claim 1 ...") is not a dependent claim." See MPEP 1801.

Here, while the claims may be dependent, they are not dependent as defined by PCT Rule 6.4. Here the dependent claims are referring to a cooperating part in the base claim, i.e. the labeling group of the peptide. Thus, the claim is not dependent under PCT rule 6.4.

As stated in the restriction, the claims drawn to a peptide labeled with fluorine-18 wherein compound (CI) corresponds to compounds (CII) through (CV) do not overlap the scope as evidenced by the different structures of the claimed (CI) compounds which label directly or indirectly a plethora of sequences with unknown identity that are not related in structure.

> With regards to the method claims, the MPEP states
> "A process is specially adapted for the manufacture of a product if it inherently results in the product and an apparatus or means is specifically designed for carrying out a process if the contribution over the prior art of the apparatus or means corresponds to the contribution the process makes over the prior art.
>
> Thus, a process shall be considered to be specially adapted for the manufacture of a product if the claimed process inherently results in the claimed product with the technical relationship being present between the claimed product and claimed process. . . .
>
> **A single general inventive concept must link the claims in the various categories and in thisconnection the wording above should be carefully noted.** The link between product and process in (A) is that the process must be "specially adapted for the manufacture of" the product. Similarly, in (B), the apparatus or means claimed must be "specifically designed for" carrying out the process. Likewise, in (C), the process must be "specially adapted for the manufacture of" the product and the apparatus must be "specifically designed for" carrying out the process." See MPEP 1850.

Here, Applicants have not shown, nor the claims specifically state, that the method claims have been "specifally adapted" for the claimed products.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 12-20, 24-25 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected Groups, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 7-02-7.

It is noted that Applicants elected the species of SEQ ID NO:1 with compound CII, where P=3. A search was conducted for the elected species and this was found to be allowable. The search was extended to the other sequences comprising the compound of CII and these too were found to be allowable. In accordance with linking claim practice and Markush practice, the search was finally extended to the broad Markush and prior art was not found that anticipated the Markush claim 1. Claims corresponding to Groups II-IV have not been rejoined because linking claim 1 has not been indicated as being allowable. "When all claims directed to the elected invention are allowable,

should any linking claim be allowable, the restriction requirement between the linked inventions must be withdrawn. Any claim(s) directed to the nonelected invention(s), previously withdrawn from consideration, which depends from or requires all the limitations of the allowable linking claim must be rejoined and will be fully examined for patentability." See MPEP 809. Thus, claims 12-20, 24-25 remain withdrawn form consideration.

2. Claims 7-11, 21-22 and 26-27 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claims should refer to other claims in the alternative only and cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). **Accordingly, the claim 7-11, 21-22 and 26-27 not been further treated on the merits.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The MPEP states that the purpose of the written description requirement is to ensure that the inventor had possession, as of the filing date of the application, of the specific subject matter later claimed by him. The courts have stated:

> "To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (" [T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." Lockwood, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966." Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398.

The MPEP lists factors that can be used to determine if sufficient evidence of possession has been furnished in the disclosure of the Application. These include "level of skill and knowledge in the art, partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics alone or coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function, and the method of making the claimed invention. Disclosure of any combination of such identifying characteristics that distinguish the claimed invention from other materials and would lead one of skill in the art to the conclusion that the applicant was in possession of the claimed species is sufficient." MPEP 2163.

Further, for a broad generic claim, the specification must provide adequate written description to identify the genus of the claim. In Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co., the court stated:

> "A written description of an invention involving a chemical genus, like a description of a chemical species, 'requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, [or] chemical name,' of the claimed subject matter sufficient to distinguish it from other materials. Fiers, 984 F.2d at 1171, 25 USPQ2d at 1606; In re Smythe, 480 F.2d 1376, 1383, 178 USPQ 279, 284-85 (CCPA 1973) ("In other cases, particularly but not necessarily, chemical cases, where there is unpredictability in performance of certain species or subcombinations other than those specifically enumerated, one skilled in the art may be found not to have been placed in possession of a genus. . . ."). Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398.

The MPEP further states that if a biomolecule is described only by a functional characteristic, without any disclosed correlation between function and structure of the sequence, it is "not

sufficient characteristic for written description purposes, even when accompanied by a method of obtaining the claimed sequence." MPEP 2163. The MPEP does state that for generic claim the genus can be adequately described if the disclosure presents a sufficient number of representative species that encompass the genus. MPEP 2163. If the genus has a substantial variance, the disclosure must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within that genus. See MPEP 2163. Although the MPEP does not define what constitute a sufficient number of representative, the Courts have indicated what do not constitute a representative number species to adequately describe a broad generic. In Gostelli, the Court determined that the disclosure of two chemical compounds within a subgenus did not describe that subgenus. In re Gostelli, 872 F.2d at 1012, 10 USPQ2d at 1618.

In the instant case, the claims are drawn to peptides labeled with fluorine-18 in that the peptide comprises formula (I). Formula (I) discloses a sequence with 12 amino acids specifically disclosed and 62 amino acids that can be selected form a Markush Group. Variable J is present in 47 different amino acid position. The claims state that variable J can be any amino acid but 50% of them have to be selected from Arg, Asn, Cys, Gln, Glu, Gly, His, Lys, Orn, Pro, Ser, Thr, and Tyr. Assuming that 100% of the J are selected from the above Markush Group, there are 5.46×10^{21} different possible sequence incompassed by the claims ($47^{13} = 5.46 \times 10^{21}$). This total does not account for the possibility of variable U, B and Z nor do they account for "derivatives" of amino acids permitted for variable J. Taking into account these variable and the fact that only 50% of the J variables have be selected form 13 specific residues, the total number of peptides encompassed by the claim 1 exceed 5.46×10^{21}. While the specification does provide specific sequences these are limited to 14 specific sequences. These peptides disclosed share some level of homology amongst one another.

As stated earlier, the MPEP states that written description for a genus can be achieved by a representative number of species within a broad generic. It is unquestionable claim 1 is a broad generic with respect all possible peptides encompassed by the claims. The sequence variation with the 5.46×10^{21} different sequences are limitless. "Thus, when there is substantial variation within the genus, one must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within the genus." The disclosure of 14 specific sequences form a genus exceeding greater than 5.46×10^{21} peptides does not adequately reflect the variance of the genus. The disclosure does not identify the derivatives of amino acids encompassed by the claimed invention. The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See In re Wilder, 736 F.2d 1516, 1521, 222 USPQ 369, 372-73 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection because the specification does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate."). Accordingly, it is deemed that the specification fails to provide adequate written description for the genus of the claims and does not reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the entire scope of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites that J can be natural amino acids or "derivatives thereof." It is unclear as to the definition of derivative. That is, it is unclear what modifications are permissible to the naturally occurring amino acids that qualify as derivatives. The specification does not set forth a definition.

Claim 1 recites that the label can be bound "directly or indirectly" with the peptide. While direct conjugation is readily understood, it unclear as to the precise definition of compound of (CI) indirectly bound to the peptide. That is, what types of associations are permitted to render the binding indirect? The specification does not describe nor exemplify indirect binding.

In claim 1, the claims recites for variable m and n that the integer is from 0 to 10, such as 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. The recitation of such as 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 seems redundant since 0 to 10 can only include such as 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

In claim 3, the as to the recitation of Ex. While the claim states that Ex is example, it is unclear if the variables of U and B are required to those listed in the table or are mere examples and the claim does not further limit the variables recited in the base claim 1.

5. Claims 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The claims are free of the prior art since the reference do not fairly teach nor suggest the conjugation as claimed. The conjugation as outlined it the specification requires that the peptide be conjugated to the maleimide group. The prior art of Zijlstra, while teaching the labeling of annexin-

V with fluorine 18, does not teach the conjugation as claimed. Note that the prior art does not teach that the conjugation of the maleimodo through a thio group of the protein, rather the reference teaches the conjugation of the label through and amine.

6. The reference of Zijlstra and Griffiths have been cited as being pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anish Gupta whose telephone number is (571)272-0965. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang, can normally be reached on (571) 272-0562. The fax phone number of this group is (571)-273-8300.

11/13/07

Anish Gupta
Patent Examiner